



City of Somerville

# URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

City Hall 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, 93 Highland Avenue, Somerville MA 02143

## MARCH 23, 2021 MEETING MINUTES

This meeting was conducted via remote participation on GoToWebinar.

NAME	TITLE	STATUS	DEPARTED
Dan Bartman	Designated Co-Chair	<i>Present</i>	
Cortney Kirk	Designated Co-Chair	<i>Present</i>	
Frank Valdes	Member	<i>Departed Early</i>	8:55pm
Deborah Fennick	Member	<i>Present</i>	
Andrew Arbaugh	Member	<i>Present</i>	
Heidi Cron	Member	<i>Present</i>	
Tim Talun	Member	<i>Present</i>	

The meeting was held via GoToWebinar and was called to order by Co-Chair, Daniel Bartman at 6:06pm and adjourned at 9:25pm. As authorized by the Somerville Zoning Ordinance, Co-Chair and Director of Planning & Zoning Sarah Lewis designated Senior Planner Daniel Bartman to serve as Co-Chair in her place for this meeting. Co-Chair & Director of Public Space & Urban Forestry Luisa Oliveira designated Cortney Kirk to serve as Co-Chair in her place for this meeting.

### GENERAL BUSINESS: Approval of Minutes

Following a motion by Member Arbaugh, seconded by Member Fennick, the Commission voted to unanimously (5-0) to approve the minutes from November 23, 2020, January 26, 2021, and February 9, 2021

### DESIGN REVIEW: 64 Webster Ave

*(continued from March 9, 2021)*

David Enriquez, Alfred Spagnolo, Dick Galvin, Ian Ramey, and Alexandra Phillips were present for the applicant team. Mr. Enriquez presented the preferred Option 2. Modified Option 2 had dark metals, warm masonry, a terracotta rain screen, and a roof deck. The corner of Webster Street had been enhanced based on feedback the team received. Landscaping had been expanded to include more plantings and outdoor seating.

The Commission appreciated the updates to the plans, especially the enhanced corner design, lobby entrance, and abutting sidewalks. The Commission made multiple suggestions for changes to the expression of the 'slot' portion of the building, including a slight recess in plane from the rest of the building. They spoke about the building materials proposed, sign locations, and the buildings horizontal articulation. The Commission also suggested a stronger differentiation of the base (ground story) from the 'middle' stories.

Following a motion by Member Fennick, seconded by Member Valdes, the Commission voted unanimously (5-0) to recommend design Option 2.

Following a motion by Member Valdes, seconded by Member Cron, the Commission voted unanimously (5-0) to recommend that all the design guidelines of the district are satisfied.

Following a motion by Member Cron, seconded by Member Fennick, the Commission voted unanimously (5-0) to recommend that all the feedback given this evening is incorporated into the revised design.

**RESULT:**

**RECOMMENDED**

### **DESIGN REVIEW: 495 Columbia**

*(continued from March 9, 2021)*

David Enriquez started the presentation by reviewing the notes the applicant team received at the last UDC meeting. He then spoke about the new design elements; including the building base, entry canopy, landscape furniture and plantings, and the service portal.

Mr. Enriquez then discussed façade options. Option 1 was comprised of metal frames, curtain wall, textured masonry, metal panels, and accent materials. The core wall grounds the center of the building. Alternate 1 was similar to Option 1, and included metal frames and had a large face on one side of the building. Alternate 2 included staggered frames and a rounded corner. Preferred Option 3 was a combination of all the options, with cut-outs, a shaved corner, and penthouse expression.

Ian Ramey discussed the landscape plan and how the applicant team incorporated the notes they received into the design. He spoke about how the team met with the abutting neighbors and are sensitive to their needs and wants.

The applicants then walked the Commission through a 3D rendering of the property, which showed areas where possible wall art would be, the bike parking, and the overall feel of the space. They showed the possible skyline view of the neighborhood.

The Commission and applicant team discussed the façade options and how they relate to the 64 Webster Ave building. The Commission suggested possibly combining two of the options together, so that the two abutting buildings aren't too similar.

The Commission brought up concerns regarding the public realm; including complete streets, the width of the pedestrian ways, and easements. The applicant noted that the through space under the building is primarily a loading zone, they did however tried to create a safe, inviting space. The Commission also had concerns regarding the largest side of the building feeling like a back of a building.

Following a motion by Member Cron, seconded by Member Valdes, the Commission voted unanimously (5-0) to recommend the Option 1 massing presented.

Following a motion by Member Talun, seconded by Member Valdes, the Commission voted unanimously (5-0) to continue the design review to the next regularly scheduled meeting.

**RESULT:**

**CONTINUED**

### **DESIGN REVIEW: 3-5 Hawkins**

Co-Chair Daniel Bartman gave an overview of the reason why this case is before the UDC. This is not a usual UDC case and will not have three façade designs to review. This case is also being seen by the Planning Board.

Peter Quinn presented the proposed design and building materials. The design included a shared roof deck, balconies, a sheltered sidewalk, and a parking garage. The building is proposed to be a Passive House, which limits the number of windows and includes solar panels on the roof.

Katya Podsiadlo presented the landscape plan. She noted that the sidewalk width is being widened to 15', as opposed to the required 12'. They have also included an exit towards the park to the West of the building as an amenity for the residents of the building. The roof deck will also have extensive plantings and they have exceed their Green Score requirement.

The Commission and the applicant team discussed building materials and the façade design. The Commission suggested creating articulation in the brick base of the building. They discussed the historic look of part of the building and the contemporary look of the other part of the building. The Commission would prefer if the applicant created a cohesive look throughout the entire building. They also spoke about the public path from Somerville Ave to the park next door. Staff confirmed that the applicant and the City are still in the process of discussing the sidewalk placement/requirements and the street trees.

Following a motion by Member Fennick, seconded by Member Valdes, the Commission voted unanimously (5-0) to recommend that all the feedback given this evening is incorporated into the revised design.

**RESULT:**

**RECOMMENDED**

### **DESIGN REVIEW: 872 Broadway**

Philip Sima presented for the applicant team. The plan is to remove the existing structure and build new construction. Parking will not be provided, as the building is in a walkshed. There will be a commercial space on the ground floor with outdoor seating in the rear and residential units above with a shared roof deck. This will be a Passive House. Mr. Sima also reviewed the landscape plan.

Mr. Sima presented three design options. Option 1 included phenolic resin panels, steel railings, ACM panels, brick, subtle signage, and planter boxes. Option 2 included fiber cement siding, full glass store front, glass railings, phenolic panels, and a much darker look overall. Option 3 included fiber cement siding, phenolic resin panels, glass railings, separated store front, and larger signage.

The Commission and applicant team discussed the building materials presented and the possibility of combining Option 1 and Option 2 to create a distinction between the residential entrance and the store front. The Commission suggested making the balcony doors of the residential units functional as windows as well, since they are the only windows in the units. They discussed the trash placement and if the residential trash should be in the same place as the commercial trash.

Following a motion by Member Arbaugh, seconded by Member Fennick, the Commission voted unanimously (5-0) to recommend Option 1 of the designs presented.

Following a motion by Member Cron, seconded by Member Arbaugh, the Commission voted unanimously (5-0) to recommend that all the design guidelines of the district are satisfied.

Following a motion by Member Fennick, seconded by Member Cron, the Commission voted unanimously (5-0) to recommend that all the feedback given this evening is incorporated into the revised design.

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>RECOMMENDED</b>
----------------	--------------------

*NOTICE: These minutes constitute a summary of the votes and key discussions at this meeting. To review a full recording, please contact the Planning & Zoning Division at [planning@somervillema.gov](mailto:planning@somervillema.gov).*